

## MEETING RECORD

**NAME OF GROUP:** PLANNING COMMISSION

**DATE, TIME AND PLACE OF MEETING:** Wednesday, June 13, 2001, 1:00 p.m., City Council Chambers, First Floor, County-City Building, 555 S. 10th Street, Lincoln, Nebraska

**MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE:** Jon Carlson, Steve Duvall, Gerry Krieser, Patte Newman, Greg Schwinn and Tommy Taylor (Russ Bayer, Linda Hunter and Cecil Steward absent); Ray Hill, Mike DeKalb, Jennifer Dam, Jason Reynolds, Becky Horner, Kay Liang, Jean Walker and Teresa McKinstry of the Planning Department; media and other interested citizens.

**STATED PURPOSE OF MEETING:** Regular Planning Commission Meeting

Vice-Chair Greg Schwinn called the meeting to order. The Clerk requested to correct the minutes for the regular meeting held May 30, 2001, to show a vote of 5-0 on approval of the Minutes of the Special Meeting held May 9, 2001. Krieser moved to approve the correction, seconded by Duvall and carried 6-0: Carlson, Duvall, Krieser, Newman, Schwinn and Taylor voting 'yes'; Bayer, Hunter and Steward absent. Duvall made a motion to approve the minutes as corrected, seconded by Krieser and carried 6-0: Carlson, Duvall, Krieser, Newman, Schwinn and Taylor voting 'yes'; Bayer, Hunter and Steward absent.

### **CONSENT AGENDA**

#### **PUBLIC HEARING & ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION**

##### **BEFORE PLANNING COMMISSION:**

June 13, 2001

Members present: Carlson, Duvall, Krieser, Newman, Schwinn and Taylor; Bayer, Hunter and Steward absent.

The Consent agenda consisted of the following items: **CHANGE OF ZONE NO. 2531bb, an amendment to the WILLIAMSBURG VILLAGE FINAL PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT; COMBINED SPECIAL PERMIT/USE PERMIT NO. 18; FINAL PLAT NO. 01005, VAVRINA MEADOWS 7<sup>TH</sup> ADDITION; and WAIVER OF DESIGN STANDARDS NO. 01007.**

**Item No. 1.1, Change of Zone No. 2531bb**, was removed from the Consent Agenda and scheduled for separate public hearing. Newman moved to approve the remaining Consent

Agenda, seconded by Krieser and carried 6-0: Carlson, Duvall, Krieser, Newman, Schwinn and Taylor voting 'yes'; Bayer, Hunter and Steward absent.

Note: This is final action on Combined Special Permit/Use Permit No. 18 and the Vavrina Meadows 7<sup>th</sup> Addition Final Plat No. 01005, unless appealed to the City Council by filing a letter of appeal with the City Clerk within 14 days of the action by the Planning Commission.

**CHANGE OF ZONE NO. 2531(BB),  
AN AMENDMENT TO THE WILLIAMSBURG  
VILLAGE FINAL PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT,  
ON PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED AT  
SOUTH 34<sup>TH</sup> & OLD CHENEY ROAD.  
PUBLIC HEARING BEFORE PLANNING COMMISSION:**

June 13, 2001

Members present: Newman, Duvall, Carlson, Krieser, Taylor and Schwinn; Bayer, Hunter and Steward absent.

Planning staff recommendation: Conditional approval, as revised on June 13, 2001.

This application was removed from the Consent Agenda and scheduled for separate public hearing due to a letter received in opposition.

Becky Horner of Planning staff submitted Conditions #1.2 and #1.3 to be added to the staff recommendation concerning revisions to General Notes #20 and #23.

Proponents

**1. Mark Hunzeker** appeared on behalf of the applicant. He stated that this may not be the last time this PUD is amended but "we are getting close". One of the most recent amendments that applies to this parcel involved a series of agreements with the abutting neighborhood associations, i.e. Jamestown and Sevenoaks. And there was a rather vague condition that was attached to these lots which limited the amount of retail space that could be in any single establishment in buildings in this particular area. As it turns out, the area has developed entirely in office space, and the intent and likely outcome of this amendment is that the entire area will develop into office space. 80% of this building is spoken for by office tenants.

Hunzeker submitted a letter from Donald and Roberta Anderson dated June 12, 2001, which supersedes their letter in opposition dated June 6, 2001. The Andersons have talked with the developer and have removed their objection to this proposal as long as the buildings will remain office as opposed to retail.

There was no testimony in opposition.

Public hearing was closed.

**ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION BY PLANNING COMMISSION:**

June 13, 2001

Duvall moved approval of the Planning staff recommendation of conditional approval, as revised to include Conditions #1.2 and #1.3, seconded by Krieser and carried 6-0: Newman, Duvall, Carlson, Krieser, Taylor and Schwinn voting 'yes'; Bayer, Hunter and Steward absent.

**CHANGE OF ZONE NO. 3313**  
**FROM R-3 RESIDENTIAL TO H-3 HIGHWAY COMMERCIAL**  
**and**  
**PRELIMINARY PLAT NO. 01003,**  
**NORTH CREEK COMMERCIAL CENTER,**  
**ON PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED**  
**AT NORTH 27<sup>TH</sup> STREET AND WHITEHEAD DRIVE.**  
**PUBLIC HEARING BEFORE PLANNING COMMISSION:**

June 13, 2001

Members present: Newman, Duvall, Carlson, Krieser, Taylor and Schwinn; Bayer, Hunter and Steward absent.

Planning staff recommendation: Approval of the change of zone and conditional approval of the preliminary plat; however, denial of the waiver of block length along Telluride Drive.

Proponents

**1. Mark Hunzeker** appeared on behalf of **North Creek Development**. This application is in accordance with the covenants and conditions that were part and parcel to the previous rezoning and preliminary plat that took place recently. The only issue is the requested waiver of the block length along Telluride Drive. This plat abuts a wetland on the southwest and I-80 on the northwest, and waivers of the block length are being granted along both of those areas. Likewise, on the east side of Telluride running along the east side of this plat, a waiver of the block length was granted because the east side of those lots is 27<sup>th</sup> Street. The only issue here is whether or not the cul-de-sac shown should be extended on down to Telluride. Looking at Lots 1 and 2, which comprise the entire frontage of this plat along Telluride, those lots have been sold to a single buyer. Together they are more than 10 acres. If this condition is not waived, they will end up with a plat which proposes a street that runs on down to Telluride, but as a practical matter, it will stop at the west line of those two lots because that 10 acre parcel will be sold in one piece and will not be owned by this developer at the time the final plat is approved. This developer will not be building that street regardless. Hunzeker requested that

the waiver of block length be granted and that access be provided via the cul-de-sac. These are businesses which will not require a great deal of drive-by traffic. Hunzeker requested that Condition #2.1.2 be amended as follows:

A modification to the requirements of the land subdivision ordinance to permit a waiver of the block length requirement along I-80, ~~and~~ the wetlands located along the southwestern boundary of the Preliminary Plat, and along Telluride Drive.

The staff's recommendation to deny this waiver is based upon the written standards of the subdivision ordinance. Lots 1 and 2 together are more than 10 acres, so once this matter is moved forward, those lots could be sold as a single parcel without a final plat. Telluride and Whitehead Drive already exist so access is there. The buyer of those two parcels will not want the street running through and splitting what he intends to buy and use as a single parcel. There will not be a street there. Access back to Fletcher is available and you can move out to 27<sup>th</sup> to get south.

There was no testimony in opposition.

Staff questions

Carlson was not sure where the road would have to make contact and he wondered about justification for the waiver being requested. Jennifer Dam of Planning staff advised that the subdivision ordinance provides the block length requirement. It would need to connect from the cul-de-sac to a point on Telluride to meet the block length requirements for ease of traffic circulation. The developer is not proposing a preliminary plat with just one lot on that frontage. There is no engineering evidence why that block length cannot be met. They can create a 10-acre parcel; however, that is not what was proposed in this preliminary plat. Carlson clarified with staff that the block length is strictly a circulation issue as opposed to a safety issue. Dam concurred.

Public hearing was closed.

**CHANGE OF ZONE NO. 3313**

**ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION BY PLANNING COMMISSION:**

June 13, 2001

Duvall moved approval, seconded by Carlson and carried 6-0: Newman, Duvall, Carlson, Krieser, Taylor and Schwinn voting 'yes'; Hunter, Bayer and Steward absent.

**PRELIMINARY PLAT NO. 01003**

**ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION BY PLANNING COMMISSION:**

June 13, 2001

Duvall moved to approve the Planning staff recommendation of conditional approval, with the amendment to Condition #2.1.2 as requested by the applicant to waive the block length along Telluride Drive, seconded by Krieser.

Carlson commented that if the block length waiver were a safety issue for emergency vehicles it would be a lot more important. With commercial and industrial it will be mostly concrete and parking lots anyway and they will circulate in their own fashion.

Motion for conditional approval, with amendment to Condition #2.1.2, carried 6-0: Newman, Duvall, Carlson, Krieser, Taylor and Schwinn voting 'yes'; Hunter, Bayer and Steward absent.

**SPECIAL PERMIT NO. 286I,**

**TO EXPAND THE SAINT ELIZABETH REGIONAL MEDICAL CENTER**

**ON PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED**

**AT 70<sup>TH</sup> & "L" STREETS.**

**PUBLIC HEARING BEFORE PLANNING COMMISSION:**

June 13, 2001

Members present: Newman, Duvall, Carlson, Krieser, Taylor and Schwinn; Bayer, Hunter and Steward absent.

Planning staff recommendation: Conditional approval.

Kay Liang of Planning staff submitted comments received from the Public Works, Health and Parks Departments. She also revised the staff recommendation to add Condition #1.3 and #3.3 in response to the additional staff comments.

**Proponents**

**1. Bob Lanik**, President of **St. Elizabeth Regional Medical Center**, presented the application. St. Elizabeth was Lincoln's first hospital and has been at this current site for 30 years. Lanik has been with the hospital for 26 years and has seen and experienced the changes in the community, neighborhood and hospital.

St. Elizabeth is now at a critical juncture where a major reinvestment and creation of facilities is needed for the health care organization to be successful and to successfully meet the community's needs. The Lincoln community is growing and the population is aging. In addition, there has been a lot of change in technology and service in the delivery of health care. In the three-year period between 1997-2000, St. Elizabeth has experienced significant changes and demands for increased capacity. Adult and pediatric admissions went up 28%;

births have gone up 22%; radiology exams increased 94%; and emergency visits are up 16%. St. Elizabeth is constantly short of emergency rooms, beds and examination and treatment rooms. They are currently rotating the emergency beds with BryanLGH. For St. Elizabeth to continue to be successful and serve the community, they do need to expand and renovate. This is important for recruiting doctors and maintaining technology.

Lanik went on to state that St. Elizabeth has been involved in an extensive planning process for the last two years. This is a very significant undertaking and they want to take full advantage and make the most of opportunities. St. Elizabeth conducted a national search for consultants, advisors and architects to help with this project. The goal is to have a very functional hospital that meets the needs of the community in terms of efficiency and capacity. But beyond that, St. Elizabeth wants a great looking project.

Lanik advised that with regard to temporary parking during construction, the plan is to relocate employees off the campus and shuttle them back and forth, leaving what parking is available on the site for patients, visitors and physicians. They also have a contract with the Veterans Hospital to lease 150 spaces. They are also in final discussions with LPS to potentially pave a parking lot on the Lincoln East campus west of Seacrest Field. Another contingency plan is potential leased spaces from a nearby church.

**2. Kent Seacrest** explained the specifics of the proposal: A new six-story tower; extensive renovation and remodeling of the present hospital; 110,000 sq. ft. medical office building; 1200 stall parking garage; expansion of the energy plant; and reconfiguration of the driveway patterns.

St. Elizabeth had a series of neighborhood meetings in January with 25 (out of 600 invited) attending. They met again in May with 5 in attendance. Basically, the two significant issues raised by the neighbors were traffic and the parking garage location. Schemmer and Associates did a traffic study and recommended approval, and Seacrest believes that Public Works has accepted those off-site road improvements. The neighbors would like to see the parking garage moved to the north side. This option was evaluated and it was concluded that it was not feasible because the parking garage needs to be at the front door of the hospital and the office building. Putting it to the north would cause the need to reorient the hospital. They were also afraid there would be too many cars going out onto "L" Street if the parking garage were on the north side.

Seacrest submitted proposed amendments to Condition #2.5 regarding signage. This is the only disagreement the applicant has with the staff. The applicant has proposed additional and larger signs at the southeast corner, the front door, the northeast corner and in the northwest corner. This is not a grocery store or gas and convenience facility—this is a hospital. Emergency issues can be stressful and trying to find a hospital entrance and emergency room is important. Seacrest contends that the signage is a public-health-safety issue. 70<sup>th</sup> Street

is a fast street and under ADA standards, studies have shown that the lettering on the signs needs to be 5" to see it going at that rate of speed. This signage has to be seen by every age group. A lot of our patients aren't necessarily young anymore and the vision is not as good as it used to be. In general, the proposed amendment seeks an increase in the signage from 50' to 80' and in one case from 50' to 120'. We want to do something more special to identify the sign architecturally.

Newman inquired whether the entire name of the hospital will be written on the signs as opposed to "Hospital". Seacrest believes it will be the name of the organization and the parent company's name. They also envision using the street address. There is no intent to advertise any specialties, but purely for information and routes to the emergency room.

Seacrest did not have a picture of the proposed sign. Carlson asked if the signs would flash, rotate or blink. The architect explained that the sign is not connective and has no moving parts. Illumination establishes the location of the sign. The signage is conceptual at this point and he did not know whether the illumination would be internal or external.

Carlson asked how increasing the square footage but keeping the message constant makes the lettering bigger. Seacrest explained that if they are required to stay within the allowed sign size, they would have to shrink the message to allow the architectural treatment. Carlson would prefer to see a mock-up of the sign.

There was no testimony in opposition.

#### Staff questions

Ray Hill of Planning staff clarified that the sign code allows a maximum square footage of 50' along major streets with a maximum height of 8'. The request is from 50' to 120'.

Carlson inquired whether the Public Works comments are incorporated into the conditions of approval and whether Public Works has comments on the applicant's traffic study. Dennis Bartels of Public Works stated that the applicant is making improvements to offset the additional trips on 70<sup>th</sup>. The main traffic handling entrance would be moved to line up with Edgewood Drive and then that intersection would be signalized. The neighbors east of 70<sup>th</sup> have asked for this signalization previously. One lane on the east side of 70<sup>th</sup> Street in Wedgewood will be widened. The existing Wedgewood Drive is 27' wide. The traffic study acknowledged impacts at the 70<sup>th</sup> & A intersection and the improvements proposed would be an additional right turn lane for south bound 70<sup>th</sup> Street, west bound to "A" Street; a right turn lane is identified westbound on "A" Street at the intersection with 70<sup>th</sup>. There might be

some minor right-of-way impacts. Bartels is requiring the applicant to identify specifically what improvements it might make at 70<sup>th</sup> and Wedgewood. The nature of the design of the campus with the parking garage and improvements focuses most of the additional traffic on 70<sup>th</sup> Street.

Schwinn asked whether Public Works foresees deceleration or acceleration lanes on the east side of 70<sup>th</sup>, or will most of the impact be on the west side? Bartels concurred that most of the traffic impact will be on the west side. There may be a right turn lane identified at Wedgewood. The impact study did not show anything on the east side of 70<sup>th</sup> Street.

Carlson asked Bartels whether he is satisfied that those improvements will be sufficient to maintain the current level of service. Bartels responded, "yes".

Public hearing was closed.

**ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION:**

June 13, 2001

Carlson moved to approve the Planning staff recommendation of conditional approval, as revised adding Conditions #1.3 and #3.3, seconded by Newman.

Duvall moved to amend to revise Condition #2.5 as requested by the applicant regarding the signage, seconded by Krieser.

Newman thinks this would result in a massive increase in signage. She would not have a problem with one larger sign at the main entrance but she does not think they need to increase the size at all four corners. She would prefer to allow one sign to be increased to 120' at the main entrance.

Carlson stated that he understands the argument for the signage but he would like to have seen it. The decision making process for him is whether the increase is necessary to get the trade-off.

Motion to amend failed 3-3: Duvall, Krieser and Taylor voting 'yes'; Newman, Carlson and Schwinn voting 'no'.

Newman agreed that it would have been nice to have a visual. She is happy to leave it as is and let the City Council make the decision.

Further discussion on the main motion. Carlson applauded the applicant and Public Works for their work on the traffic studies and he is pleased with the information that was presented. It was clear what the impacts were and what improvements are necessary to mitigate those impacts. Carlson believes that the signage proposed could work, but he needs to see it in order to make that decision.

Newman thinks this is a wonderful testimony of working with the neighbors in that there is no opposition at this hearing.

Motion for conditional approval, as revised by staff, carried 6-0: Newman, Duvall, Carlson, Krieser, Taylor and Schwinn voting 'yes'; Hunter, Bayer and Steward absent.

**SPECIAL PERMIT NO. 692K,**  
**AMENDMENT TO THE TABITHA NEW COMMUNITY**  
**COMMUNITY UNIT PLAN,**  
**FOR DOMICILIARY CARE**  
**ON PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED**  
**AT 5501 SEA MOUNTAIN ROAD.**  
**PUBLIC HEARING BEFORE PLANNING COMMISSION:**

June 13, 2001

Members present: Newman, Duvall, Carlson, Krieser, Taylor and Schwinn; Bayer, Hunter and Steward absent.

Planning staff recommendation: Conditional approval.

Jason Reynolds of Planning staff submitted additional comments from the Public Works and Health Departments. The I zoning referred to by the Health Department is east across 27<sup>th</sup> Street. This area is far to the west of the I-1 zoning.

Proponents

Dana Van Beek Palmer of the Harding, Schulz & Downs Law Firm, presented the application. This is a request to amend the existing community unit plan special permit to provide domiciliary care in two of the six apartment buildings. Tabitha proposes to change only the use of the two buildings from elderly residential to domiciliary care. This amendment would convert 28 apartment units (12 units in one building and 16 in the other) into 28 domiciliary care units. The buildings would be modified according to ADA standards and a covered walkway will be provided between the two buildings. No additional outside construction will be necessary. This will allow the residents to remain in the same community if their care needs rise above the threshold of elderly housing. This application conforms with the Comprehensive Plan and advances the goal of providing housing appropriate to the requirements of households with special needs.

Carlson inquired as to the additional services that will be provided in the domiciliary portion. Van Beek Palmer responded, stating that it is an assisted living facility for residents that have additional medical needs. It is basically assisted living with a registered nurse on staff with aides to provide personal care. The RN will administer medications.

There was no testimony in opposition.

Public hearing was closed.

**ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION BY PLANNING COMMISSION:**

June 13, 2001

Duvall moved to approve the Planning staff recommendation of conditional approval, seconded by Taylor.

Carlson believes this is a great facility and it is perfectly appropriate to have the additional services.

Motion for conditional approval carried 6-0: Newman, Duvall, Carlson, Krieser, Taylor and Schwinn voting 'yes'; Bayer, Hunter and Steward absent.

**STREET & ALLEY VACATION NO. 01009**

**TO VACATE NORTH 11<sup>TH</sup> STREET,**

**GENERALLY LOCATED AT NORTH 11<sup>TH</sup>**

**STREET AND FLETCHER AVENUE**

**PUBLIC HEARING BEFORE PLANNING COMMISSION:**

June 13, 2001

Members present: Newman, Duvall, Carlson, Krieser, Taylor and Schwinn; Bayer, Hunter and Steward absent.

Planning staff recommendation: Denial.

Proponents

**1. Donald Spilker**, 1201 Fletcher Avenue, testified in support of the proposed vacation of this county right-of-way. He owns Lot 26 which borders Fletcher on the north, 14<sup>th</sup> Street on the east and I-80 on the south, and abuts on the west side of the 30' strip of right-of-way that is approximately 1100 feet long, or a total area of about 27.5 acres. All of the land surrounding the proposed vacation is zoned AG and used as single family acreage dwellings. Lot 26 is approximately 20 acres in size, all used as a Christmas Tree farm, along with a 40' x 60' building used as a service shop, for storage of equipment and as a sales building for the Christmas Tree operation. The property is also his home.

Spilker is seeking this street vacation because he needs more room to accommodate the Christmas Tree customers in November and December of each year. Being able to purchase the additional 30' of right-of-way would allow him to add onto his building on the west side. This 30' strip was set aside in approximately 1888. Maybe at that time they were thinking that some day there would be a road running north to south, but when I-80 was put through this section, it left this 30' strip of right-of-way on the north side of I-80 with nowhere to go. A few years ago there was 600' to the west of this 30' strip that was vacated because it dead-ended into I-80 and would never be developed into single family lots.

Spilker urged that it makes sense to get surplus property back on the tax rolls after this many years where it can be incorporated in with another property that can make use of it. There is not a property owner interested in paying to have a street built when it will serve no purpose. LES and the phone company now use the property to service their equipment along this right-of-way and Spilker would have no problems giving easements for their continued use. The through streets in this area now are 7<sup>th</sup> Street and 14<sup>th</sup> Street, and they have bridges that cross over I-80. All of the acreage owners are serviced from either 7<sup>th</sup> or Fletcher.

### Opposition

**1. Craig Carlson**, 1001 Fletcher, the property owner on the west side of this road, testified that he is a little naive or uneducated about the ramifications of this street vacation. All he can see now is that it potentially would interfere with future development. He is not necessarily in favor or in opposition because he does not know all the potential ramifications. However, at this point in time, he stated that he is opposed, but he would like to know more about the codes and the future city plans, etc.

### Staff questions

Carlson noted that the staff report indicates high potential for redevelopment in the near future. Mike DeKalb of Planning staff noted that the city limits are just to the south with development to the west and to the east that is currently underway. It is in the future urban area and there is a high opportunity for development to occur in the future.

Carlson asked the advantage of having dedicated right-of-way if someone wanted to replat to single family homes or smaller urban type lots. DeKalb's response was that currently, there is 30' of existing road right-of-way. A road to the west of this area was vacated. That was fine because all of the parcels that remained had frontage or access to Fletcher or 7<sup>th</sup>. The scenario here is 30' of right-of-way that could be used under replatting, but by vacating it the lots that abut that street on the west have no access. It creates landlocked parcels. The staff's recommendation is based upon the combination of creating landlocked parcels and losing the opportunity to either build on this road or vacate it at the time of replatting to figure out the appropriate configuration.

Schwinn noted that we have already given up half of this right-of-way. DeKalb believes it was just a half street to begin with. There is no road directly to the north—there is existing right-of-way but no road.

Response by the applicant

Spilker contended that the area will never be developed into individual lots because the length of the ground involved is not long enough to justify the cost of any developer or any landowner wanting to pay for a street or put in the utilities. Everyone that lives out there is an acreage owner and it is going to remain acreages. He is not in favor of creating a roadway and paying for streets and utility costs. Everybody is serviced either off of 7<sup>th</sup> or Fletcher. If 11<sup>th</sup> Street were to run through to the north, it would run right into a house. 11<sup>th</sup> Street will never go north.

Public hearing was closed.

**ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION BY PLANNING COMMISSION:**

June 13, 2001

Duvall moved to approve the street vacation, seconded by Schwinn.

Duvall has mixed feelings but he thinks the attempts of development will probably not happen. Schwinn agreed. Any development that does occur will not occur on that specific point. He believes it would develop as a community unit plan with new roadways. He does not see that it is a significant parcel for the county.

Carlson agreed with the potential future but he wonders about the ability to swap out right-of-way for right-of-way. Looks to him that there may have been a mistake on the earlier vacation. Maybe this one should have been vacated instead. He stated that he will err on the side of caution.

Newman agreed with Carlson. She does believe it will be developed and it might be a mistake to vacate this road.

Motion for approval failed 2-4: Duvall and Schwinn voting 'yes'; Newman, Carlson, Krieser and Taylor voting 'no'; Bayer, Hunter and Steward absent.

Carlson moved to deny, seconded by Newman and carried 6-0: Newman, Duvall, Carlson, Krieser, Taylor and Schwinn voting 'yes'; Hunter, Bayer and Steward absent.

**CHANGE OF ZONE NO. 3321**

**FROM R-7 RESIDENTIAL TO B-4 LINCOLN CENTER**

**BUSINESS DISTRICT, ON PROPERTY GENERALLY**

**LOCATED AT 1729 M STREET.**

**CONT'D PUBLIC HEARING BEFORE PLANNING COMMISSION:**

June 13, 2001

Members present: Newman, Duvall, Carlson, Krieser, Taylor and Schwinn; Bayer, Hunter and Steward absent.

The applicant had submitted a written request to place this application on pending. Newman made a motion to place this application on pending, seconded by Duvall and carried 6-0: Newman, Duvall, Carlson, Krieser, Taylor and Schwinn voting 'yes'; Bayer, Hunter and Steward absent.

There was no public testimony.

**CHANGE OF ZONE NO.3279**

**FROM AG AGRICULTURAL TO AGR AGRICULTURAL RESIDENTIAL,**

**and**

**SPECIAL PERMIT NO. 1868,**

**WINDMILL RIDGE ESTATES COMMUNITY UNIT PLAN,**

**and**

**PRELIMINARY PLAT NO. 00023,**

**WINDMILL R4IDGE ESTATES,**

**ON PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED**

**AT SOUTH 70<sup>TH</sup> STREET AND COUNTRYVIEW ROAD.**

**CONT'D PUBLIC HEARING BEFORE PLANNING COMMISSION:**

June 13, 2001

Members present: Newman, Duvall, Carlson, Krieser, Taylor and Schwinn; Bayer, Hunter and Steward absent.

The applicant had submitted a letter dated June 6, 2001, requesting that these applications be placed on pending until January, 2002. So moved by Duvall, seconded by Taylor and carried 6-0: Newman, Duvall, Carlson, Krieser, Taylor and Schwinn voting 'yes'; Bayer, Hunter and Steward absent.

There was no public testimony.

**COUNTY SPECIAL PERMIT NO. 186**  
**FOR A GOLF COURSE, DRIVING RANGE,**  
**CLUBHOUSE WITH RESTAURANT AND MAINTENANCE FACILITY,**  
**ON PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED**  
**AT N.W. 140<sup>TH</sup> STREET AND W. HOLDREGE STREET.**  
**CONT'D PUBLIC HEARING BEFORE PLANNING COMMISSION:**

June 13, 2001

Members present: Newman, Duvall, Carlson, Krieser, Taylor and Schwinn; Bayer, Hunter and Steward absent.

Mike DeKalb of Planning staff submitted a letter in opposition with issues regarding water usage and pumping; future housing; buffer zones; tunneling over W. Holdrege and paving of W. Holdrege.

The applicant had submitted a letter dated June 7, 2001, requesting an additional two week deferral to meet with the opposition and their attorney. DeKalb advised that Mark Hunzeker, who represents the opposition, supports the request for deferral.

Duvall moved to defer, with continued public hearing and administrative action scheduled for June 27, 2001, seconded by Newman and carried 6-0: Newman, Duvall, Carlson, Krieser, Taylor and Schwinn voting 'yes'; Bayer, Hunter and Steward absent.

There was no public testimony.

Meeting adjourned at 2:20 p.m.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 2:20 p.m.

Please note: These minutes will not be formally approved until the next regular meeting of the Planning Commission on June 27, 2001.